3:3

et JOURNAL

lent 1957

E T S Journal

volume iii number 3 lent, 1957

Contents

Warren W. Jackson
The Christian Doctrine of Providence 1

Three Thoughts on Clinical Training:
Michael Allen: Love and Horror.....11
Walter Pragnell: Boston City.....15
Joe Burroughs: Bellevue.....20

Clement Barbey
Impressions of the Episcopal Church.....23

Thomas L. Hayes
Masonry: A Post-Christian Cult? 29

...

The E T S JOURNAL is published quarterly by the students of the Episcopal Theological School. Chairman: John H. Gill Senior Editors: Brian Kelley, J. C. Michael Allen. John Snow, Barbara Jackson. From the Faculty: William J. Wolf.

Single copies 25¢ One-year subscription, one dollar postpaid. Address all correspondence to the JOURNAL, 99 Brattle Street, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF PROVIDENCE

by Warren W. Jackson

(This essay was originally submitted as a term paper in Systematic Theology, Fall Term, 1956.)

It is difficult to say whether Providence is principally a doctrine or a problem. A consideration of the factors which the idea of Providence involves soon leads to other areas of concern: to the doctrines of God, creation, Sin, Miracle, and Prayer. The questions which give rise to and are derived from these doctrines are of equal concern to the theologian and the man in the street. In fact, the questions asked by Joe Doakes are apt to be as searching as those asked by the theologian. We are all deeply dyed with a metaphysical awareness, yet the resources of reason are inadequate to deal with many of these problems in a way that leaves the questioner satisfied.

The doctrine of Providence lies at the root of many of the basic problems that trouble men. "Why did God let an explosion in a Texas school kill hundreds of children?" "Will God answer my prayers?" "Is it right that the head of Murder Incorporated lives in a Mediterranean villa while I haven't enough to eat?" "Why did my child die of polio?" These are the questions that people ask. They turn to their pastors for answers. It is the astor's responsibility to reply. One day that responsibility will be ours. What will our answer be?

In order to deal with the questions of others and to find meaning in our own lives each of us must hold some system of belief which takes account of the factors behind these questions. It is impossible to find a complete answer to any of them: not even a partial answer can be found to some. Nevertheless we must do the best we can, knowing that growth in knowledge and personality will continue to throw more light upon the whole system of thought.

Questions which relate to Providence are apt to be loaded. They come freighted with the questioner's assumptions about the nature of God and the world. At the core of most of these assumptions is a belief that God is at least supposed to be loving and just and in control of the world. But this fact doesn't seem to correspond to the situation we find ourselves in. We are surrounded by injustice, cruelty, indifference, pain, untimely death, and the impersonal hostility of nature. This surely cannot be God's world

I. A Doctrine of Creation

Before a doctrine of Providence can be constructed it is first necessary to establish some basic ideas concerning the nature of God's creative act. (It is assumed that God is accepted as the creator of the universe in some sense, otherwise the term "Providence" has no meaning.) Belief in God as Creator can be established anywhere between the poles of Deism and Pantheism. If the Deistic view is held, God becomes the "watchmaker" and the universe is postulated to work on mechanistic cause-and-effect principles. This view is fatal to the concept of Providence as God's continuous care of the world, because the course of events for all time would necessarily be established in the mechanics of the creative process. Predestination is a necessary corollary to Deism. Conceivably this view could be modified by the occurence of miracles. In this framework a miracle would consist of God tampering with the system through the suspension of cause-and-effect relationships. Such tamperings would still leave a predetermined system subsequent to each miracle. Even with the number of miracles infinitely multiplied the asymptotic limit would only be a puppet world with God pulling the strings.

At the other extreme lies the world of the Pantheist. Here God is suffused through all of his creation so that no part of him lies outside or above it. The creation becomes indistinguishable from God. Man's freedom to reason independently becomes absorbed in God's reasoning activity and the concept of Providence becomes meaningless.

Somewhere between these extremes lies the truth. The Christian view of Creation is Judaistic in origin. God created the universe ex nihilo. Time itself is best understood as a part of this Creation. God's existence is in no way dependent upon the existence of the universe. Having created the universe God exists in relationship to it. The nature of this relationship determines the nature of Providence.

II. God's Relationship with the natural order

The doctrine of Providence can best be considered by dividing the total creation into two categories: the natural world, and man. This is somewhat of an oversimplification since animals are an integral part of the natural world by this definition, yet man is part animal. Similarly, man is distinguished from the rest of creation largely through his reasoning powers, but to some extent the higher animals share this ability. This type of gradation is characteristic of the whole creation. One cannot draw a sharp dividing line between the plant and animal worlds. The border is blurred between life in a simple organism and the inanimacy of a complex enzyme. Where does the dividing line come between the last of the man-like apes and the first of the ape-like men?

a. The Inanimate Order

For our purpose it is helpful further to divide the natural world into categories of animate and inanimate objects. The principal distinguishing feature of inanimate objects is the uniformity of their behavior. Water always reaches maximum density at 4 degrees Centigrade. When zinc is added to hydrochloric acid the result is always hydrogen and zinc chloride. Why? Two explanations are possible. One is found within the Deistic view of a cause-and-effect world. The other view is that God is at every instant sustaining his

creation with his power. If he withdrew this power the universe would cease to exist. The very process of sustaining is carried out in these uniform ways in which inanimate objects act. Man has observed the ways and expressed the mathematically as laws.

This arrangement makes life possible for man for he can rely on the way things will react. Otherwise we might notice with Tweedle-dee that

> The sun was shining on the sea,
> Shining with all his might:
> He did his very best to make
> The billows smooth and bright --
> And this was odd, because it was
> The middle of the night.

Within this framework miracles are no longer acts against the so-called laws of nature but become "natural" in that they stem from the same source of power that makes a stone fall.

Even here the picture is not so clear-cut as first it seems. The simple laws of Newtonian physics have been largely supplanted by Schrödinger's Quantum Theory. It is probable that the whole structure will again be revised by Einstein's theories. The Heisenberg uncertainty principle has permanently laid to rest the theoretical possibility of predicting future events.

b. The Animate Natural Order

If we pass to a consideration of the animate portion of the natural world (still excluding man) we find that the same principles and laws which undergirded inanimate nature are valid, however new complexities are found within the living organisms. No longer is the total system expressible in mathematical terms. Motions no

longer can be predicted by the postulation of mechanistic cause and effect relationships since new factors of reflexes, instinct, urges, and a crude sort of reasoning are added. What is the method of God's control over animate nature? The ever present principle of gradation makes it difficult to say, but it seems to be a control somewhere between the ordering of inanimate nature and man's qualified freedom. It assumes the predominant characteristics of neither since the life principle supplants mechanism and yet there is little influence from reason and none from moral awareness.

III. Fallen Nature

This is not all that can be deduced from the observation of nature. There are other factors that bear on the question of Providence. Anyone who has watched a cat play with a mouse, or a duckling pulled under the surface by a snapping turtle usually feels that there is something wrong with this facet of nature. There is something right about the idea of a peaceful coexistence of lion and lamb. There is something unnatural about nature as we see it; something cruel and evil in spite of its beauty and glory.

A part of the answer is found in the fact that some animals must eat others to live. The death of one gives life to another. There is some consolation in the fact that pain may not be as acute in animals as in man. Some biologists feel that there is more joy in the animal world than man assumes. The fact that an animal is unable to worry and is ignorant of the fact that it must die perhaps is often overlooked. Nevertheless, in spite of all this, there is a fallen quality in nature closely akin to the fallen quality in man. There is something incongruous about the idea of a loving, protecting God who

marks the fall of every swallow, and that of a tiger killing a deer. Paul saw this when he wrote, "We know that the whole creation has been groaning in travail together until now" (Rom. 8:22). It is as though fallen man has dragged the rest of creation down with him. Pain and cruelty in nature can be partly explained but the ultimate question remains an insoluble mystery.

IV. God's Relationship With Man

Moving from a consideration of the natural world to man we see first that he is deeply involved in the inanimate and animate universe below him. He is subject to the same laws of mechanics as a stone. His cell structure bears a relationship to that of plants and animals. He is, however, the highest of God's creatures (at least known to us) because of his ability to reason, his moral awareness, and his free will. His ability to reason and his free will are so far above that of the most intelligent animal that they are for all practical purposes discontinuous with the animal's. Of all creatures only man has moral awareness. He has indeed been made in the image of God. However, by using his free will to set himself at the center of his own life, man has introduced sin into the total picture. Sin found expression in pride, lust, hatred, envy, and all the wickedness that feeds on them. As we shall see this has a strong bearing on the question of Providence.

V. A Partial Answer

Having established this much of a world view, a partial answer to the questions that the doctrine of Providence raises can be found. In a world where human bodies are subject to that expression of the power of God which is defined as

the laws of nature, it is inevitable that bones will break when they are hit hard enough. Physiologically, pain is a necessary part of the complex warning system that keeps us from injuring ourselves. In such a universe there is a chance that an avalanche will kill a man. The pain that warns us to keep away from fire can be used by an inquisitor for his purpose. God could stop a man from being killed by an avalanche by acting in a 'miraculous' way. Since miracles are few and far between we may infer that God attaches a great deal of importance to acting in prdictable patterns. God could stop a torturer from molesting his victims but the cost of free will is greater. In fact there are no circumstances under which he will override it.

Some of the pain we endure, some of the deaths that seem unreasonable because of their prematurity, are a necessary corollary to the type of universe we live in.

VI. The Core of the Problem

The core of the problem of Providence still remains to be considered. To what extent and in what way does God direct and govern men's lives? It is reasonable and necessary to assume that there is a purpose in God's world. The teleological development of the universe is assumed to be directed towards the fulfillment of this purpose. Knowing mind has eveolved from unknowing matter. Man cannot fully comprehend what the final goal may be except to say it is that time when the Kingdom of God will be established and all men will be in complete rapport with God and each other.

How can this goal be fulfilled when man's fallen state has so infected him (and perhaps

the natural world) with evil that many of his actions are directed against the establishment of God's Kingdom? To say how this may be is to say how Providence works.

This is God's world. Just as he has ordained the manner of its creation we may assume that he has ordained the fulfillment of his goal. A man that designs a ship that doesn't carry enough fuel to reach its destination isn't much of an engineer. We may safely assume that as a creator God is competent and that the creation will fulfill his purpose in spite of all that man may do to prevent it. But how? Not surely by God's direct and continuous control. He does not want to be in rapport with a universe full of automatons. Such a universe negates the validity of reason itself. Not by giving man free will and leaving him strictly alone. Such a universe would soon degenerate into anaannex of Hell. God acts by expressing his will through the orderly sustaining of the natural world, by exerting a non-coercive influence on mankind, through acts which because of their nature are called miracles, and through the prayers of his creatures. In these ways he guides the universe towards its ultimate goal.

These methods of fulfillment take place along two lines of action: within the lives of individuals, and within history. There is an interaction between these two methods. A person looks at history and sees evidence for the existence and nature of God in his revelatory acts. This evidence may well affect the course of his life. On the other hand, the lives of certain men, because of their quality, have greatly influenced the course of history.

How strongly God may direct a person's life by non-coercive influence is plainly known by

anyone who has undergone a call to the ministry or to any other vocation. What the call may lack in coerciveness is supplemented by persistence. God, in fact, influences the lives of individuals who in any way open their hearts to receive his grace.

Such a person may further God's will through prayer -- especially intercessory prayer. How it works is not for man to know. That it does work will be attested by anyone who has seriously tried it. It is perhaps enough to say that God is able to use a part of ourselves that we surrender to him through the act of prayer and creatively use this to help others.

That God acts as effectively in history as in the lives of men individually is seen partly in the history of nations, particularly that of Israel, but more especially in the central act of all history, the Incarnation. This is the most drastic single act that God has performed to direct the world toward its true goal. By identifying himself with man and absorbing man's sin at its worst he has overcome the alien invader -- sin -- and conquered irrational death, making it possible for man to share this victory and press on toward the fulfillment of his goal.

This method of acting redemptively is a theme that is repeated throughout all creation and is another method that God uses to further his work. Sickness can be the occasion for growth in patience, understanding, and courage. Death can be the occasion for the growth of character. In general, adversity always offers an opportunity that can be used for growth.

In all these ways the God is at work in his world, guiding it toward his destined goal. He is persistent. He is not coercive. He can turn the tables on evil and use it redemptively.

VII. Conclusion.

In spite of all that has been said it is not unlikely that a person might be unconvinced about the Providence of God. Such a person might well quote Matthew 6:25-32 and ask if no Christian ever went hungry or cold. He might point to Matthew 7:11 and ask if martyrs were never burned alive. Has never a Christian starved to death? I do not know what the answer to this is, but intuitively I feel that it is a question which must be answered existentially. I only know that God has taken care of me. I do not know how much strength he has given martyrs to face death or how completely a starving Christian has placed his trust in God. I do know that the witness of others attests his faithfulness.

It is along these lines that I feel a system of thought can be constructed that accounts for God's Providence in the face of discouraging evidence of sin, pain, unfairness, and evil in the world. In the last analysis we must accept the fact that the solution to the whole problem is obscure.

"For now we see through a glass, darkly;
but then, face to face."

Three Thoughts on Clinical Training

I. LOVE AND HORROR
by Michael Allen

There were five of us on the stage. Two student nurses, the patient and I, and the director. We were doing psychodrama in a mental hospital.

The patient had selected us from the audience of patients and therapists. He said I looked a little like his older brother, and one of the nurses reminded him of his mother. His father was dead and he was sixteen, and very sick.

We weren't getting very far until the director asked me to play Jimmy the patient, and Jimmy to play his own father. Now Jimmy was a pretty husky young fellow, a good athlete, but a terrible baseball player. So I said, somewhat tearfully (perhaps because I have the same problem), "Dad, why can't I throw a ball like the other fellows? Why, why can't I?"

And Jimmy, as if from far away, said, "That's all right Jimmy. You don't have to be good at everything -- not everything. After all everybody has some faults." Then silence.

Then Jimmy spoke again, with excitement this time. "Come on Jimmy, I'll take you out in the back yard and show you how to throw a ball."

A small boy's dream of a father who could show Him how.

show him how. So many demands, so many demands were put on Jimmy and on you and me. Impossible demands, many of them. As if we were somehow supermen who could always be good and always kind. But I'm not a superman; neither are you; and certainly Jimmy wasn't. And all he wanted was someone to show him how. To help him, to lead him along the paths of life. Someone to love him as he went.

Experiences like that don't fade very fast. They stick and they stick hard and they make a seminarian think about his Christian calling. And they make him wonder about himself -- how far have I told people to be good and not told them how?

There are so many experiences like that in a mental hospital. Not that they are any different from otdinary life. They really aren't. It's just harder to run away from them. And after all sooner or later we must all face situations like this. Face them and see through them to the other side.

And in the clinical training situation with a horde of people more experienced, more trained tham the seminarian it's so much easier to go through trying situations. People don't just tell you to be good and to be kind and to be generous, they show you how. They show you how in the context of troubled lives and battered souls, and a man comes out of a mental hospital a deeper man. A little seared, perhaps, but a little glorified too.

I remember the fellow in my group who couldn't accept love. Sounds silly, doesn't it, not being able to accept love? But it's true. He could only give it, not accept it and when you've given and given, suddenly there isn't

anything left to give.

I suppose he was afraid of a controlling love, that love which grapples with your soul, submerges your personality, and leaves you nothing but a puppet in the hands of your lover. And of course he was right to fear that kind of love, which isn't really love at all. But in the hospital he met a wonderful and tender man, a gentel and loving man who scared him half to death. But as the weeks went by that man wasn't so frightening after all. And bit by bit that seminarian ceame to see the freedom of love, the everlasting glorious freedom that comes from receiving love. So at the end he and that other man left very close indeed.

Who is to say that Christ was not in some mysterious way in that other man, reaching out his hand to a seminarian who had much to learn, even about his faith?

Because we must never make the mistake of thinking that Christ cannot be in a mental hospital just as much as in a seminary. Nor can we ever afford to say that Christ is not as much in a psychiatrist's heart as in a seminarian's. That other man in the mental hospital who brought Christ into the life of a seminarian was performing a Christian ministry too.

But there is another side to clinical training and perhaps it is none the less valuable. I remember sitting in a staff meeting where the s senior psychiatrist was interviewing a girl who had tried to stab her lover to death. It was a pretty terrible experience and she didn't want to talk about it at all. But the psychiatrist probed and probed and it was pretty obviously painful and some of the ministers in the crowd winced at the brutality of that

doctor.

But then it was over She left the room and the psychiatrist turned to some of us and said, "The trouble with ministers is they can't face horror. You'd talk to that girl and pooh-pooh her experiences and pat her on the head and say it was all right -- or maybe you would condemn her, but you wouldn't listen to her. But she's got to talk. She has to talk and talk until she has gone through that experience and drawn the sting out of it Because if she doesn't it will fester in her mind and destroy her."

That's hard to take. With one fell swoop all of us condemned. But maybe we deserved it. I don't know. But after all that s life. Not everybody is going to like you of me and I'm afraid to say I suspect we won't always like everybody else. And sooner or later we'll have to face that side of life: All the people that hate us and hate the church and even hate our Lord. And the worst blow will come, and it may be in clinical training, when we discover that other ministers hate us because we are Episcopalians.

I wish we could avoid this sort of thing. I'd like to be at peace. But it looks as if we can't always be at peace and if we have a chance to go through some of these tough things, perhaps with a friend at our side, perhaps with some sympathetic and trained people at our side, maybe we can take it better next time. And when this happens in the seummer between school years, we have the next year to dig in and learn how the saints took it, how our friends took it. Then I think we'll step into the world better ministers, better prepared to bring Christ's Gospel to the world. Better prepared not because clinical training made

our faith any deeper -- though it might -- but beacuse it helped teach us how to do better and more with what the Lord gave us, and continues to give us.

So after all clinical training is just another bit of experience, another hunk of life and like all life mixed in its blessing. But a hunk of life which may make us deeper, richer men to speak the Gospel of Christ to a world that wants to know "How?"

"Come on, Jimmy, I'll take you out in the back yard and show you how to throw a ball."

II. BOSTON CITY
by Walter L. Pragnell

Last summer, with four other ETS students and an Episcopal priest, I spent twelve weeks in clinical training at Boston City Hospital. The program, which was run by the Andover-Newton Theological School, was intended to train fifty men in the basic principles of hospital chaplaincy work. We soon found that the first immediate objective, after the ususal two weeks of orderly training in the wards, was to "get to know ourselves better." Unfortunately, this soon became the main purpose of the program as a whole, and such things as serving the needs of the patients of the hospital ran a very poor second.

Since it must be obvious at this point that I was very unhappy over the results and methods of the program, let me pick out some key problem areas. First, the supervision. With the exception of a few men, the supervisors had had little experience. About half of them had only the benefit of taking the very same work the

previous summer. They certainly were not qualified for the supervision of other students. Second, the classes. It was assumed that no one coming into the program had ever had a course in basic psychology, and for some unknown reason it seems to have been decided that presenting the ideas of Freud five different ways by as many lecturers would somehow make up for that basic deficiency. One lecturer was really good, but by the time we were exposed to him we students were all thoroughly fed up, and his time and effort were wasted. It will suffice barely to mention that there were several projects obviously concocted to keep students from having any free time in the evening for other studying. Third, relationships with the patients. We were provided with just enough of the tricks of the trade to make us adept at prying into the lives of patients, without any complementary means of using what we had learned to help the patients. It was emphasized that our calling hours were deliberately rgulated by the way classes were scheduled, so that we had only two hours a day in which to call. Once each week half of that time was taken up by a conference with one's supervisor. And yet it was precisely in calling upon patients that the greatest value of the program seemed to lie. Looking back from my present perspective, there is no question in my mind but that visiting patients taught me morethan anything else that I value in that program's curriculum. The work as an orderly and the visiting were both satisfying and edifying, while I begrudged every moment that classes kept me from the patients. I had the pleasure of helping a paralyzed man begin to care about getting well, and mine was the solemn joy of helping to comfort a lonely man dying of cancer. I was honored by being specifically invited, after the program was over, to that man's funeral.

The three areas mentioned above are all problems of faulty administration, and with care they could be remedied. But the one basic difficulty is, I believe, theological. It colored every aspect of the program, from the attitudes of other students to the interpretation of written reports by the supervisors. Never vefore did I realize how important the doctrine of the Church is, nor how much it is often coveted by others who do not share it. The first symptoms were a steady sniping at all things Episcopal by supervisors; at first it seemed like joking and we laughed it off, but the quantity with which it paured out showed that it was sincerely meant. In group therapy sessions many students and some supervisors admitted that they envied our depth of conviction, or perhaps it was our confidence, and agreed that somehow the holding of things catholic in tension with things protestant seemed to be the key to what they envied, however impossible it was to reason that tension out. But there was apparently no conception of the Church as a fellowship of sinners in the process of being redeemed and helping to redeem; rather the Church was regarded as a collection of maladjusted individuals banded together for mutual psychoanalysis. There was no give-and-take, no attempt to understand genuine theological conviction. My own supervisor was bound by his own admitted prjudice against Anglicans generally, and he could not see how I could sincerely hold that the Episcopal Church is genuinely free; to him it was rigid, barrow, and confining, and he insisted on judging it by that standard. Often his comments on my reports showed how defensive he was, and this attitude of his was confirmed in group therapy and in private discussions. But I was not alone by any means; the Episcopal priest had troubles, too. When, in a report, he noted that his patient had made a formal confession, and did not report the contents of that

confession, he was called to task. Upon his pointing out that, as a priest, he could not violate the seal of the confessional, he was told that he was "not cooperating." The regular chaplains insisted that they had the right to administer the Holy Communion to anyone they wished, regardless of that person's views to the contrary. They also stated that they felt th emselves under no obligation to call a patient's own pastor, and that, indeed, those pastors were inclined to be rather troublesome. I can see why.

One more incident will serve. It was the custom at Holy Communion services to use wine, despite the strong feelings that many of the students from Baptist and Presbyterian backgrounds had toward the use of alcoholic beverages. When surprise was shown at the use of wine, one of the head chaplains said, "We like it." On the other hand, one Baptist student was heard to say, after a Communion service, that he had never touched wine before, and that he was repelled. It is hardly necessary to point out the seriousness of turning people away from the Lord's Table if they are sincerely opposed to alcohol when the decision to use wine is the arbitrary choice of the chaplains, justified only by saying "We like it."

Symptomatic of the entire situation, it seems to me, was what greeted us in the first week of calling. We were all given slips referring to the Protestant patients in the hospital, but over two-thirds of those patients had been discharged by the time we got their slips from the regular chaplains. The average stay at Boston City Hospital is eleven days. This meant that, on the average, those name-slips had been in the chaplains' office slightly over a week, during which time the patients received no pastoral care. Symptomatic, too, was the fact that while the Roman Catholic Church had seven

priests constantly available on less than five minutes' noticem there was no Protestant chaplain any nearer than Newton outside the hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Every patient, without exception, on whom I called mentioned the way the Roman clergy came in every morning to administer the Holy Communion to their patients, and a comparison was always drawn between them and their Protestant running-mates. Several nurses said that they wished there were a Protestant chaplain available to visit at night. One of them said, "At night is the worst time for the patients. You can almost feel the fear that walks up and down the wards."

A program as thoroughly psychological in orientation as this one expects to cause frustration and tension in its students, and looks forward to doing so. This is taken as a sign of success. But there must be evaluation of the tension. At Boston City it was never admitted that any complaints were ever soundly based, valid, or constructive. Rather, criticism was usually considered a sign only of immaturity.

It has been with great reluctance that I have written these words, for they are bound to be misunderstood by many who read them. For the benefit of such people I say here that I love that hospital -- it is both terrible and wonderful. But until there is a basic reorientation of the clinical training program, I could not possibly recommend it to anyone.

III. Bellevue
by Joe Burroughs

The clinical pastoral training program at Bellevue Hospital in New York, sponsored by the Council for Clinical Training, Inc., is recognised throughout the nation as one of the best inclusive clinical programs. The 1956 summer session was under the direction of the American Foundation of Religion and Psychiatry and opened with the Foundation's annual, week-long seminar, attended by thirty ministers representing ten states and Canada and many denominational and pastoral situations. Their questions concerning pastoral problems were fired at a panel of doctorsm psychiatrists, and minister which included Dr. Smiley Blanton, author of Love or Perish; Dr. Herbert Holt, director of the Association for Applied Psychoanalysis; and Dr. Otis R. Rice, president of the Council. We eleven seminarians were participating observers of the entire session and workshops and here received our introduction to what proved a grueling summer of hard work and insividual analysis and psychotherapy.

Program Included General and Psychiatric Wards

We were divided into two groups under the Reverends Frederick C, Kuether and Hugh S. Hostetler. Each group jad sessions twice weekly, based on problems from our chaplain-patient encounters; every man met with his counselor at least one hour a week for personal help. Each Thursday morning the Rev. Mr. Al Hart, who completed in June a year's study under Dr. C. G. Jung in Zurich, lectured comprehensively on Freud, Adler, Horney, Sullivan, Fromm, and Jung, and on psychiatry in relation to the parish ministry.

All eleven met together each Tuesday to evaluate the student-chaplain sermon taped in the hospital chapel the previous Sunday. Each of

us preached once in the general hospital chapel, once in the psych-prison ward, and once in the psychiatric ward itself.

We were on duty individually as the official Protestant chaplain for the entire hospital (general and psychiatric wards) one full day and night, and three addituonal afternoons. Our work was spread throughout the hospital and offered many varied experiences, both satisfying and frustrating. After two weeks our group meetings turned into psychotherapeutic sessions; after three weeks ten of the eleven men were involved in as many as four additional hours per week of personal analysis and therapy at the Foundation. The American Foundation generously gave us of its time and resources, administering to us the Wechsler-Bellevue and Rorschach tests, and explaining to each individual his results. This analytic therapy and the normal patient demands resulted in extreme mental and emotional tensions, the inherent dangers of which are obvious. The General Seminary in September protested against the depth of the program, stating that probing of such intensity should not be forced upon one without his so choosing.

Understanding Gained from Group and Patient Contacts

The results of the program were enlightening and valuable, both for self-understanding and creative understanding of other people. This was gained more from our mutual work within the group than from our patient contacts, which were, contrary to some programs, our most genuine touch with reality during the weighty periods of introspection. The Foundation staff estimated that each of us had at the termination of the course the equivalent of a year and a quarter of analysis and psychotherapy.

Seminary Should Help Solidify Experience

My criticisms of the clinical requirements are directed more toward E.T.S. than toward the program itself. Our school fails (1) to integrate the information gained during the summer even partially into its courses, and (2) to reorient students, all of whom undergo definite crises in a genuinely clinical program, to the school in light of their deeper understanding and recognised needs. Such reorientation is a recognised necessity and is a requirement made by the Council of a seminary for membership in the Council for Clinical Training. I understand that Virginia Seminary requires the faculty to have clinical training for this reason. This may be one basis for their renowned student-faculty relationships often lacking here.

Anyone who has had deep patient relationships within training definitely encounters helpful questions which speak directly to subject matter, especially to theology, and these should not be flippantly handled. Anyone who knows even a little about analysis understands the need of reception back into the academic group and also the potential in this reception for resultant genuine growth and teamwork. These aspects of clinical training should be used and not stultified.

A third point of omission: the meager information concerning the type programs and their various leaders and what can be expected from them given at E.T.S in the briefing session is unfortunate. If more information of a concrete nature were given, the student could make a wiser choice of programs more in line with his needs and the faculty's aims.

I could more heartily endorse here the excellent program at Bellevue if these three criticisms were met constructively by our faculty.

IMPRESSIONS OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

by Clement Barbey

It is perhaps presumptuous for me to write about a Church which I have known in a limited area and over the brief period of six months. Yet, while fully aware of the dangers, I wish to give expression to certain observations I have made while living at ETS and travelling through the Diocese of Massachusetts. And, in order that my readers may know the context of my reactions, I shall begin by saying a few things about my own church, the Swiss Reformed Church -- or, more precisely, the Reformed Churches of Switzerland.

My country has been blessed by the fact that ninety per cent. of our protestants are members of the reformed tradition, and there is consequently no denominational problem. At the same time, our Church is not really a "Church" at all, but a Federation of small Churches having essentially the same theology but differing for historical reasons in their relations with the state. Each "canton" entered the Swiss Federation with its own Church organization already developed, and this structure has everywhere been preserved unchanged. Some "cantons" have state churches, others not; but everywhere the church government is presbyterial in character.

Theologically, we have the reputation of being Calvinists, while in fact the doctrine of the Reformer has long since been perverted by a number of different influences. Only in the last twenty years have the ministers who quote Calvin really known what they are speaking about. Today the theological picture in Switzerland can be roughly outlined as follows. The strong Liberal movement which prevailed up to the first World War now survives, with a few exceptions, among some of the older men who fight with little success for its preservation. Against liberalism have risen two strong and sometimes complementary movements. The

first is neo-orthodoxy. For although Barth's Dogmatics has not been read by very large numbers, his thought has nevertheless borne fruit at the parish level by virtue of his concern fo a real understanding of the Cross in its implications for every-day life. (To understand Barth, of course, we must be aware of his social and political commitments, which have had a powerful effect on the inactive and "bourgeois" Churches.)

The second movement against Liberalism is the result of Ecumenical contacts, which have made us aware of the Catholic branches of the Church. This discovery has first expressed itself in a liturgical renewal. But we have quickly come to understand that there is no real liturgy without a sound ecclesiology. Our study of the theology of the Church has directed us toward a renewed understanding of the sacraments and of the ministry -- and we are not yet at the end of our discoveries! And these new insights have already shown some practical results worthy of notice.

At the beginning of the century, our worship services consisted of a long sermon, accompanied by free prayers and rather romantic hymns. The Holy Communion was served four times a year. Today, although we do not yet have a prayer book, the services have found a stable order, which includes all the elements contained in "Morning Prayer." The ministers are free to use whatever prayers they want but more and more have come back to the classical forms which are found in all the official liturgies of the Church. Our new hymnals have a section reserved for liturgical responses which are used as much as local tradition allows. The communion is served at least once a month in every parish, and in towns where several churches are found, a rotation system has been established so that people may attend eucharistic services more often if they wish.

These changes are coming gradually. If we are still far from what some of us would like to see, we don't feel free to go so fast as to

leave some Christian members of our communities isolated from a Church in which they would no longer be at home. The process of reorientation must be accompanied by an educational process at least as difficult to carry on as the reform itself. The creation of the Protestant monastery of "These-Les-Cluny" in France and of the convent of "Grandchamp" in Switzerland has been an important step in this direction. The members of both these communities, through retreats and missions, have brought a new spirit to a part of our laity, and have even convinced some good old protestants of the value of private confession.

These developments, followed very closely in our seminaries, have dfinitely influenced the new generation of our clergy.

Through this very incomplete outline, you can understand that it is not by chance that I decided to spend one year in an Episcopal Church claiming to preserve the apostolic tradition. Having heard and read about it and meeting regularly ministers of my Church who believe that we are reaching a point where the question of the apostolical succession and episcopacy ought to be restudied, I was anxious to test, if I may use this word, the life and thinking of an Episcopal church, against the criteria which as a protestant I considered essential: a true preaching of the Gospel and a real missionary spirit. It must be added that my questions were much more centered on the witness of the Church than on its essence. I know that this approach may be considered inadequate by members of the Anglican tradition; but still I want to express my concern which is, in the last analysis, the concern of all European protestants facing this problem.

How much is the thinking of the Church conditioned by its belonging to a tradition going back to the early beginnings of Christianity? What is the influence of the traditional worship of the

Church on a living community? Does the organization of the Church, under the direction of Bishops, give to the body the feeling of belonging to something much larger, both in time and in space, than the local parish?

As you may have noticed in the first part of this paper, I have a strong feeling of reaction against a liberalism which has in my eyes weakened all strictly-thought-out theology and often reduced all religion to a concern of the heart, speaking to the sentiments and feelings, and which by excluding the head from the religious process has resulted in a new form of dualism and transformed the act of faith in the second person of the Trinity into a sentimental contemplation and imitation of the good example of Jesus.

My lack of knowledge of Anglican Church history explains, therefore, my surprise when I discovered the state of theological decomposition which for some time has been characteristic of a Church which, because of its Ecclesiology, I expected to be more or less orthodox.

In this school, for instance, most of the theological discussions among the students are on problems related to liturgics, sacraments, or the Church; yet it is very difficult to relate these matters to the Christology from which they ought normally to be derived. The question of the Church seems to be the only strong theological concern, but it is lost amid theological concepts which the individual is left to understand and accept for himself. If this is, to say the least, queer in theological circles, it becomes really dramatic in the few parishes I have visited. Most of the people I have met -- and here I do not intend to express judgment of any sort, but only my

understanding of what I have seen -- seem to be very little aware of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Articles of Religion. The emphasis is put on the parish and its activities, the preaching is honest and earthy, and works seem to be much more valuable than a committed faith.

The tendencies in Christian Education reflect the same situation. To react against abusively authoritarian methods, the emphasis is put on the self-expression of the pupil, who is supposed to discover the major facts of religion through a "majeutic" system. I know that Calvin states that to know God you have to know yourself; and after all Christianity is not something we have in us originally, but an exterior fact that we are called to accept or reject. And to be able to take that step, is it not necessary to insist on one totally exterior fact: the fact of Salvation through Jesus Christ, rather than on our hidden personality?

To come back to my first question, I have been highly impressed by an understanding of the Church that I do not find so widespread in my own denomination. But here a problem arises. I don't see how, in the American picture, it is possible to combine this sense of the "Church", which ought to involve a tremendous appeal for missionary work, with the existing self-centeredness of parish life.

In the worship of the Episcopal Church, I have also realised in a quite new way the catholicity of the Church, and have admired the regular and high attendance at many services. I will remember for a long time the two confirmation services I attended, because in them I felt a sense of continuity I have never noticed in my own Church, where confirmation takes place at the age of fifteen or sixteen, when we consider children to be capable of independent decision. But here again: Is the life of the local parish centered on the Sunday worship, or is it centered

on the many weekly activities that take place around the parish house? In other words, how much is the religious life a give-and-take process? Are we paying God by good works, or are we accepting his gifts and, with his help, making them bear fruit?

From the organizational standpoint, I must confess that the diocesan system has made me rather jealous, not so much of its efficiency as of the real sense of community that it creates. The parish-diocese relations leave an outsider no doubt that the parish is a part of a greater whole. I have been surprised, however, to see how congregationslistic the parishes seem to be in their relations with one another. As I have said before, I have also been struck by the lack of evangelistic and missionary spirit at the local level.

At the end of a paper in which I have probably inadequately expressed how much I have found so far and how much I have felt at home, this remains my big question: Why does this episcopal Church, so richly blessed, have, at the local level, so much difficulty promoting the spirit that will make of each Christian a witness of such a Grace?

Masonry: A Post-Christian Cult?

by Thomas L. Hayes

It is certainly no accident that Mr. Cleasby's article, "The Church and Freemasonry," should have appeared recently in this beloved journal (E.T.S. Journal, III,1.) Freemasonry in America is enjoying today a "phenomenal" revival and it is only Christian that the Church give it notice. To this end I have felt compelled for some time to notice it and then to say "no dice."

Mr. Cleasby's Presupposition

Now Mr. Cleasby's article created no stir in the Community - to the chagrin of many of us. For it certainly indicates anew the frozen mentality of the Church in this place. The judgment is upon us to recognize the fallacy of his fundamental presupposition which forms the illogical base of post-Christian religion. Midway in the article Mr. Cleasby scales the peak of his argument:

> "Why should churchmen be disgruntled with Freemasonry or jealous of its apparent success? It is a moot question how many Freemasons that are not active in church activities would be so if Freemasonry did not exist or ceased operations."

A moot question, indeed! In other words, were it not for Freemasonry Christianity would be flat on its back. Do you see a satanic invasion here? I do. For I see a post-Christian return to salvation by good words and gnostic wisdom. The real dynamic behind Mr. Cleasby's article, though he be unaware of it, is not even sub-Christian, but anti-Christian. His presupposition, widespread now, is this: because Masonry is a "God-centered, moral fellowship," it is "good" and ought, therefore, be respected, and even revered. We might as well say: because turnips

are good vegetables, I ought to eat them and love them. And perhaps join the Turnip Growers Association of America.

Before I lose you let me recognize that Mr. Cleasby's attempt is genuine and conciliar in intention. He is, however, concerned to show that Masonry is nothing secret and nothing private. As a matter of fact it is something terribly secret and terribly discriminating. Mr. Cleasby contradicts his early statement late in the article by arguing that "Freemasonry, only a fraternal fellowship, must be careful of who is admitted that none may reflect harm on its intergraty." It is patent to some of us that this attitude is anti-Christian, that is, not according to the mind of Christ who came not to create a moral fellowship after esoteric wisdom but to deliver men from the bondage of the Jewish Masonry of the first century. The real challenge in my present discussion is this (to Mr. Cleasby and to my father, and to any other Mason be he bishop or layman): under what conditions is a Christian truly justified in joining any society that has secrets bearing on faith and morals about which he is not supposed to know anything before hand and about which he is not at liberty to consult an impatial adviser afterwards. For Freemasonry is in fact a secret society of a very different origin from the Church (which did go underground, yes, and then later came out.)

Some Secrets Revealed

Lest this business of secrecy be dispatched on the grounds that "everyone knows Masonry to be good because they do good," here is marshalled some evidence. The "secrets" are

in fact not so secret as most Masons believe. They are readily obtainable at Widener Library in The Revised Ritual of Craft Freemasonry, A. Lewis (Masonic Publishers), 1942. And it is clearly begging the question to argue, as Mr. Cleasby does, that since many ecclesiastics are in fact Freemasons it must be all right to join. This attitude is to ignore the real nature of the Masonic vow to secrecy. The initiate is solemnly obligated to "hele, conceal and never wilfully reveal" the "secret arts and hidden mysteries" (from the Ritual.) This is done under the penalty of having his tongue torn out, his throat cut from ear to ear, and his body buried in the tidal sands of the sea. To be sure, this is kind of a joke among Masons, but the obligation to secrecy prevails. There is a Holy Bible upon the altar but only in those cultures where Christianity must be respected on pragmatic grounds. Elsewhere "the Holy Scriptures of any religion may be substituted.... alternate sets of Scriptures are provided so that a Jew may be obligated on the Pentateuch, a Moslem on the Koran, and so on." To the average Masonic layman God is God, no matter how we address Him, but the spokesman for Christianity must certainly question: Do we really worship the same God?

Furthermore, upon entrance to the craft the candidate is "hoodwinked" in order that "his heart might conceive before his eyes were permitted to discover" and also to suggest the life of darkness from which the candidate comes to be delivered. He is admitted to the lodge on the point of a sword to symbolize the danger undertaken in the quest for light. He is then conducted around the lodge and examined as to "fitness" and instructed to approach the East by the proper steps (three irregular steps of nine, twelve, and fifteen inches.) This brings one to the Altar where on a bare left knee with right hand on the Volume of the Sacred Law (which may but not necessarily be the Bible), his left hand supporting compasses (one point held to his naked left breast), he takes the oath under the penalty of death. The "secrets are conferred and he

then takes the "first regular step," is given the sign (right hand with thumb to the left of the windpipe drawn across the throat), receives the grip and the word (always to be given by halving or lettering): Boaz, meaning "in strength." The other degrees are much the same in nature, obligation and secrecy. There is one further element, however: the missing secret name for God. This name was secreted by Hiram in a vault under the Temple and later discovered and opened at the rebuilding in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah. This name is Jaobulon, only given by the three Grand Masters together. It is avowedly syncretistic, "a compound word - Jao, the first, is the Chaldean name of God - it is also a Hebrew word signifying I am. Bul is an Assyrian word, signifying Lord. On is an Egyptian word signifying Father of all." Quite obviously, this word is extra-Biblical.

Now what does all this mean? If it were only a game we could wish to share the joke, but it is serious business. Whether it is the Lord's business is another question. Freemasons may claim that all this can be endured since the moral values inculcated are worth the cost of nonsense. It is even argued, I suppose, that the cardinal virtues of the Gospel of redemption in Christ are included, but this is for this Christian at best irrelevant. For all this seems to me a reversion to shadows when the Light of the World has shone forth for all in our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a reversion which might well be called a post-Christian cult in a world which is still scandalized by the risk of complete self-surrender to Christ. As such it takes on the character of a substitute religion, as Mr. Cleasby implies, to fill the gap between good men and God. The gap between men and God is clear, of course, and it will avail nothing to anyone to ignore or to cloak in these "secret arts." The Good News is that God in Christ has bridged that gap and brought us into His forgiving and powerful Presence. To walk the plank of Christ is to be justified by faith in Him alone! Christ died and rose and LIVES for you and for me, no matter who you are. Do we dare for a single moment seek our salvation elsewhere? For these reasons I dissent from Mr. Cleasby and reject Masonry as a delusion of the Devil.